



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

cm
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,940	09/27/2001	Paul Portmann	33966	2200

116 7590 03/31/2003
PEARNE & GORDON LLP
526 SUPERIOR AVENUE EAST
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-1484

EXAMINER	
LUEBKE, RENEE S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2833
DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	licant(s)
	09/964,940	PORTMANN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Renee S. Luebke	2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
 Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,7,8 and 10-12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 4-6 and 9 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 12 February 2003 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Application Number: 09/964,940
Art Unit: 2833

1. The proposed drawing corrections, filed on February 12, 2003, have been approved by the examiner. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. Claims 4 and 5 are objected to because of the use of "preferably" therein.

Claim 6 is objected to because "transitional" (line 3) should be changed to -transition- in order to be consistent with claim 1 from which it depends.

Claim 10 is objected to because it lacks antecedent basis for "the switch-housing sections" on line 2. It is suggested that this section be deleted.

Claim 11 is objected to because it is dependent upon cancelled claim 3.

Appropriate corrections are required.

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 11 recites the broad

recitation "miniaturized devices", and the claim also recites "especially in hearing aids" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 7, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robinson, et al. This switch comprises switching elements 14, contact surfaces 24 and a thermoplastic diaphragm 16 that butts against a housing 12. The diaphragm is prestressed to secure the switching elements against the contact surfaces. In regard to claim 11, the keyboard of Robinson is seen to be miniaturized.

7. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson. In regard to claim 8, the number of contact surfaces is seen to have been an obvious matter of design choice; applicant does not indicate a particular reason for using three or four, or any other number. In regard to claim 10, it is noted that Robinson does not indicate the material for the housing 12. However, it is common to form such a member

from a 2-part injection molded plastic. Therefore, it would have been obvious to form the housing of Robinson in this manner.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The switch of Neumann comprises an elastic diaphragm that is prestressed and presses the switching element against the contact surfaces.

9. Claims 4-6 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form obviating the above noted objections and including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. It is suggested that responses to this final action be faxed to:
(703) 872-9319 or 308-7722, 308-7724
Please refrain from sending a confirmation copy, as noted in 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(b).
For formal communications, please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE."
For informal or draft communications please clearly label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT."

Alternatively, responses may be mailed to:

Box AF
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:
Crystal Plaza 4, Fourth Floor (Receptionist)
2201 South Clark Place, Arlington, Virginia.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mrs. Renee Luebke at (703) 308-1511. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mrs. Paula Bradley, can be reached at (703) 308-2319.



Renee S. Luebke
Primary Patent Examiner
March 24, 2003